

minimum import prices are used to protect domestic agricultural prices.

ITALY

Like other Common Market nations, Italy uses the variable levy-gate price system. Additional controls include state trading of wheat under a special EEC grant and temporary governmental authorization of imports of certain food items, such as livestock, meats, butter, and oil. State trading is also active in tobacco. Citrus juices other than grapefruit and fresh grape imports are embargoed.

BELGIUM

The variable levy-gate system of the EEC Common Agricultural Policy regulations is used by Belgium. Import quotas, minimum import prices, and seasonal restrictions are also used. Until recent years Belgium protected agriculture less than most West European countries. More recently, however, farm groups succeeded through government intervention in obtaining both higher domestic prices and increased protection from imports.

FRANCE

France as a member of the Common Market uses the variable levy-gate system and, in addition, has seasonal and arbitrary embargoes on imports.

VENEZUELA

A large percent of agricultural commodities entering Venezuela are subject to an import licensing system. In some cases, the license is required for public health and sanitation; however, in most cases it is intended to protect and encourage local producers. In addition to the licenses, importers of certain products are required to purchase a fixed quantity of the domestically produced product for each unit of the product imported. Additional import controls are exercised through the foreign exchange market.

Venezuela had a minimum of restrictions on international trade throughout the post-war period until 1960. At that time balance-of-payments problems led to further restrictions.⁵

SPAIN

For many years, all imports into Spain were subject to license. Such licenses for dollar imports were normally granted only for goods regarded as essential to the national economy. Upon becoming a member of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation in 1959, Spain freed many imports from licenses. Most of the liberalization, however, occurred in the industrial sector. In addition to licenses, an annual global import quota is used, and a "fiscal tax" is imposed on most imports. All these restrictions are in addition to normal import duties.⁶

UNITED STATES

This Nation has quotas on some farm products as a part of the domestic price support program. These quotas limit imports. In addition the United States has some informal import limiting agreements and unusually high health and purity requirements which limit such imports as meat and rice.⁷

WOOL MANUFACTURERS NEGLECTED—COTTON GETS MORE HELP

(Mr. CLEVELAND (at the request of Mr. HARVEY of Michigan) was granted

permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the lavish help the American cotton industry has received from the Federal Government is in striking contrast to the bitter neglect given our woolen industry. Imports of cotton textiles into this country are limited by quotas established to aid our domestic mills in meeting foreign competition. With the passage of the wheat-cotton bill, cotton mills will now receive windfall Government subsidies. Under this unfortunate wheat-cotton legislation the top five cotton mills, based on their last year's use of raw cotton, will receive estimated subsidy handouts paid by the U.S. taxpayer as follows: \$16.5 million, Burlington mills; \$13.5 million, Stevens mills; \$11.3 million, Springs mills; \$9 million, Dan River mills; and \$7 million, West Point mills.

The woolen industry does not ask for subsidies, but it does ask that the administration keep the promises it made to limit woolen imports. The administration negotiated an international agreement in 1962 which established quotas on cotton imports. Promises were given that a similar agreement or other controls would be established for woolens. These promises were believed by legislators who supported the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. But these promises have been broken by an administration that has sat idly by as woolen mill after woolen mill has shut its door due to an uncontrolled flood of cheap foreign woolen imports. Failing to establish any international agreement on wool quotas, the administration—Kennedy and then Johnson—has also failed to impose unilateral restrictions on wool imports. Since 1947 over 300 woolen textile mills employing more than 100,000 workers have closed. Meanwhile imports are steadily increasing.

The President's concern for the cotton industry but utter disregard for the plight of the American woolen industry is illogical, unfair, and ruinous. The American woolen industry does not seek the costly Government paternalism given cotton, but this dying industry does deserve a chance to live by the fulfillment of previously made promises.

(Mr. ALGER (at the request of Mr. HARVEY of Michigan) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. ALGER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

"E" AWARD TO CESSNA AIRCRAFT CO. FOR EXPORT EXCELLENCE

(Mr. SHRIVER (at the request of Mr. HARVEY of Michigan) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be present at the White House on Monday, May 18, 1964, for the presentation by the President of an

"E" Award, symbol in excellence in world trade, to the Cessna Aircraft Co. of Wichita, Kans. Cessna was 1 of 10 U.S. firms honored. Mr. Dwane Wallace, president of Cessna, and Mrs. Wallace were present for the awards ceremony.

Cessna sold 54 percent of all American light airplanes exported in 1962. It exported 22.9 percent of its total sales in 1963 to markets in Latin America, Europe, Africa, Australia, and Asia. The company has often participated in Department of Commerce trade fairs and took part in the USIA exhibit in the Soviet Union, Transportation U.S.A., in 1961.

In addition to its many achievements and contributions to private aviation, Cessna has contributed significantly in the production of defense materials for the free world.

I am proud that Cessna Aircraft Co. is one of several aircraft manufacturers in my congressional district which has helped establish Wichita and the State of Kansas as a leading aviation center of our Nation. My warmest congratulations to the Cessna team upon receiving this most deserving award for export excellence.

SOVIET ANTISEMITISM

(Mr. HORTON (at the request of Mr. HARVEY of Michigan) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to call my colleagues' attention to the greatest deception in modern history: the false claims the Soviet Union lays to its liberation of mankind.

All of us are aware that the Communists point to the multinational Soviet state in support of their contention that peoples of differing racial and religious backgrounds can live in harmony under communism. However, what is said and what is done are as opposite as possible. The Communists are not liberators, they are captors; and, their totalitarian terror is especially felt by minority groups.

The plight of Soviet Jewry offers shocking evidence of the real Soviet attitude toward minorities. While pretending that antisemitism has no part of official policy, the Communist regime is conducting a full-scale program of persecution against the Russian Jews. The subjection of these people proves and exposes the falseness of the Communist doctrine of liberation.

Today, all the power of the Soviet state is pressed into a campaign of attrition, a campaign designed to erode traditional Jewish values and institutions. If successful, there will be no free expression of Judaism allowed in the Soviet Union. A great faith will be rendered helpless by atheistic forces of godless communism.

Let me cite a few examples of the sort of discrimination Soviet Jews are experiencing in the U.S.S.R. today.

In the religious realm of life, Jews suffer the severest disabilities. Education of young rabbis, a vital aspect of the life of any religious community, is made extraordinarily difficult. Until 1957, no

⁵ U.S. Department of Commerce, Overseas Business Reports, "Licensing and Exchange Controls of Venezuela," Pub. No. 63-80 (1963).

⁶ U.S. Department of Commerce, "Economic Development in Spain 1960"; "Basic Data on the Economy of Spain" (1960); "Economic Developments in Spain 1961."

⁷ Joint Economic Committee, op. cit.

Jewish institution existed to train rabbis. In that year a rabbinical academy was established as a adjunct of the Great Synagogue in Moscow. Since then, only two men have been ordained as rabbis. Neither has been able to function as a religious leader. This is but one example of the type of religious discrimination Soviet Jews suffer.

The same type of discrimination exists in the political, economic, and cultural realm where the awful presence of Soviet power is felt everywhere. Jews are discriminated against in the universities and in the political life of the state. Jews are not permitted, for example, in the foreign service. Jews have been tried and executed as criminals in cases clearly designed to stir up deep anti-Semitic feelings in the Soviet Union. Jews are ridiculed in officially sponsored propaganda attacks where they are held up to the scorn of society as unwanted pariah.

I ask that the people of the Afro-Asian countries who may be tempted by the vaunted Soviet claims of liberty, equality, and fraternity to look at reality.

I ask them to look at the case of Soviet Jews, for here is the evidence upon which to judge the validity of Soviet claims of democracy and humanity.

Mr. Speaker, morality and justice demand that we, as a free and democratic people, rebuke the base and despicable actions of the Soviets towards Russian Jewry. This unmerciful persecution by the agents of international communism must be held up to the scorn it deserves.

Let us speak out continually in condemnation of the Soviets' denial of religious freedom. Certainly, all Americans have an obligation to take part in this battle against intolerance and discrimination.

I believe that this Congress has a right and duty to resolve its sense of condemnation of the deplorable anti-Semitism which today exists in the Soviet Union. For that reason, I support the adoption of a number of pending resolutions, notwithstanding the State Department's recommendations against them. I urge my colleagues to familiarize themselves with this problem and to work for House action and approval of these resolutions that would demonstrate anew that freedom of religion is held dear by the people of the United States and that we are not afraid to denounce those governments which pervert this principle.

(Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. HARVEY of Michigan) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

(Mr. ASHBROOK'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.)

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. DWYER) is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mrs. DWYER addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.)

PANAMA CANAL AND THE MILTON EISENHOWER PAPER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Lorraine Room of the Hotel Lafayette in Washington, D.C., at 2:30 p.m. on April 7, 1964, was the scene of an unusual press conference that purported to appraise problems related to the Republic of Panama and the Panama Canal. Attended by Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, who is a brother of ex-President Eisenhower and now heads Johns Hopkins University, former U.S. Ambassador to Panama Joseph S. Farland, and other members of a so-called Republican Citizens Committee's Critical Issues Council, the conference was promptly followed by a deluge of publicity in the mass news media featuring the first paper issued by this so-called committee under the title of "Panama: A Realistic Appraisal." (For full text see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 8, 1964, pp. 6972-75.)

Described the next day in the Congress as "an excellent alternative program for dealing with Panama issue" and as "the very finest contribution of the opposition party to a bipartisan foreign policy and approved editorially in the Washington Post, the Eisenhower statement was obviously intended for propaganda purposes and it was extensively exploited in the press of the United States as well as that of Panama—Star & Herald, Panama, Republic of Panama, April 8, 1964.

Mr. Speaker, such propaganda exploitation in this era of managed news and controlled press is not accidental but the result of planning to obtain maximum publicity rather than a "realistic appraisal" and clarification that the Isthmian situation so urgently needs.

Since then, I have had an opportunity to examine this amazing declaration in greater detail and I find it to be a bewildering muddle of the first order—reckless, unrealistic, and unworthy of serious consideration. In view of the volume of reliable information published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and elsewhere in recent years on Panama, the Panama Canal, and interoceanic canals generally, it is indeed difficult to understand the failure of Dr. Eisenhower and his collaborators to produce a better informed and more objective paper. It reflects little credit on those who lent their names to give it prestige and I am glad to see from accompanying notes that all members of the self-appointed and unofficial Republican Citizens Committee's Critical Issues Council do not necessarily subscribe in every detail to all the views expressed and that the positions taken by them do not represent official Republican policy.

IMPORTANT POINTS OVERLOOKED OR MINIMIZED

In an effort to be "all things to all people," those who prepared the subject paper on Panama, overlooked certain very important facts. Because of their importance I shall enumerate some of the more significant:

First. That the Isthmus of Panama has always been, and still is, an area of endless bloody revolution and today is seething with revolutionary communistic activity led by Red agents trained in Cuba and elsewhere, some of whom were observed leading the January mob assaults on the Canal Zone.

Second. That this Red influence is firmly entrenched in the University of Panama and in the Panamanian Government and is all powerful in the formulation of Panamanian foreign policy. This was recently illustrated by the unreasonable and discourteous demand of President Chiari, dictated by some of the Red revolutionaries, to hoist the Panama flag at full mast at the same time the U.S. flag was at half mast in respect to the memory of General MacArthur. This procedure permitted hoisting the Panama flag superior to that of the United States, which display is contrary to the laws of our country. See picture on front page of the April 8, 1964, issue of the Panama Star & Herald.

Third. That the Eisenhower paper does not squarely present the historical fact that Panama is not, and never has been, a nation in the sense of Argentina, Brazil, England, or France, but an artificial creation that grew out of the movement for an Isthmian Canal, and that it was not a partner in the construction of the Panama Canal and is not a partner now.

Fourth. That the paper fails to show that the United States has important treaty obligations with respect to the maintenance, operation, and protection of the Panama Canal with Great Britain and Colombia, as well as with Panama; and, in fact with the entire world.

Fifth. That it ignores the realistic fact that where there is responsibility, such as that involved in the Government of the Canal Zone and the management of the Panama Canal, there must be adequate authority; and that such sovereign authority in perpetuity granted in the 1903 treaty was primarily rooted in the recommendations of the Isthmian Canal Commission and not in the work of the French engineer who became the first Minister of Panama to the United States.

Sixth. That it does not reveal that Dr. Eisenhower and Ambassador Farland were key participants in promoting and executing the illegal display of the Panama flag over the Canal Zone territory in September 1960 in contemptuous disregard of the overwhelming vote—381 to 12—of the House of Representatives in opposition to such display—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 2, 1960; also of a unanimous vote of the Congress taken after extensive hearings and debates on the Gross amendment—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 9, 1960—to prohibit such display. The reason for these actions in the Congress was that informed congressional leadership realized that the formal display of the Panama flag within the Canal Zone in recognition of Panamanian "titular sovereignty" was contrary to treaty and international usage, and "charged with dangers that